(3) Single Bench

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH

JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

Review Petition No. 23 /06

W.P.No. 159 /96

PETITIONER : R.N.Rana S/o Shri Natwar Singh
Aged About 60 years
R/O L.I.G. –28, Sector-1
Shankar nagar , Raipur(C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :(1) Dena Bank, A Banking Company incorporatedunder the Banking Companies (Acquisitioand Transfer of undertakings) Act 1970, having it's Head Office at Maker Towers 'E' Cuffe Parade, Bombay 400 005 Through the Chairman

P.R. No. 31 20/06
Presented by Shri R.N. Rana, petitioner
dated 10/12/06

OATH COMMISSIONER APARNA MALVIYA CG 03/96 10/12/06 Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

(2) The General Manager, Personnel Administration & Social Banking (PASB) Dena Bank, Mkaer Towers 'E' Cuffe Parade, Bombay 400 005

(3) The Deputy General Manager, Dena Bank, Maker

(u) 6

Towers 'E' Cuffe Parade, Bombay 400 005

(4) The Assistant General Manager (Personnel), Personnel Department, 7th Floor, Dena Bank, Maker Towers 'E' Cuffe Parade, Bombay 40

APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF THE ORDER DATED 6/9/2006

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

REVIEW PETITION NO.23 OF 2006

Applicant : R.N. Rana

versus

Non-Applicants : Dena Bank and others

BY CIRCULATION

ORDER
(Passed on 30th of October, 2006)

The present applicant seeks a review of the order dated 6-9-2006 (Annexure P-1) passed in Writ Petition No.159 of 1996 not on the ground of discovery of any new facts or any manifest error in the impugned order but in the nature of rehearing of the case in the guise of review application.

2. This review application is circulated in the chamber for consideration under Chapter VI Rule 76(2) of the High Court of Chhattisgarh Rules, 2005.

3. I have perused the review application and documents appended to the present application as well as papers of Writ Petition No.159 of 1996. This Court, after hearing both the parties, dismissed the petition on the ground that there was no irregularity or impropriety or unreasonableness or deficiency in decision making process. The

charges leveled against the applicant have been established on the basis of sufficient evidence. It is well settled that the review proceedings are not by way of an appeal and have to be strictly confined to the scope and ambit of Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure even in exercise of review jurisdiction by the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The applicant has not produced any new ground for review except the same grounds which have been considered and decided in the writ petition.

4. Principle of law is well settled by several judicial pronouncements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of *Smt. Meera Bhanja vs. Smt. Nirmala Kumari Choudhary*[1], *Lily Thomas, etc. vs. Union of India and others*[2], *Ajit Kumar Rath vs. State of Orissa and others*[3], *Government of T.N. and others vs. M. Ananchu Asari and others*[4] and *Kerla State Electricity Board vs. Hitech Electrothermics & Hydropower Ltd. and others*[5].

5. As a result and for foregoing reasons, this review application is dismissed on the ground that this review application is not in accordance with the requirements for review of an order as per law and the present review applicant seeks rehearing of the case in the guise of review application, which stands concluded by order dated 6-9-2006 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.159 of 1996. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
SATISH K. ANGNIHOTRI
Judge

1 AIR 1995 SC 455
2 AIR 2000 SC 1650
3 AIR 2000 SC 85
4 (2005) 2 SCC 332
5 (2005) 6 SCC 651

Gopal